<div align="center">

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING OF THE**
**ARIZONA GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION COUNCIL**
**OF MEETING**
<u>**FEBRUARY 8, 2007**</u>

</div>

A public meeting of the Arizona Geographic Information Council was convened at 10:01a.m. on February 8, 2007 at the Arizona Department of Administration, 100 N. 15th Ave., Phoenix, AZ 85007 in Room 406. Present at the meeting were the following members or designees of the Arizona Geographic Information Council:

Lee Dexter, Northern Arizona University
Victor Gass, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
Gary Irish, Arizona State Land Department
Adam Iten, Arizona Department of Administration
Rick Harrington, Southern Arizona Geographic Information Systems
Jana Hutchins, Arizona State University
Dave Minkel, National Geodetic Survey
Manny Rosas, Pima Association of Governments
Timothy Smothers, League of Arizona Cities and Towns
Tom Sturm, US Geological Survey
Gene Trobia, Arizona State Cartographer's Office
Tom Tyndall, designee for Bradley McNeill, Arizona State Parks
Jason Howard, designee for Rita Walton, Maricopa Association of Governments
Jessica Smothermon, designee for Lisa Danka, AZ Department of Commerce
Carol Warren, AZ Department of Education
Chris Newton, Arizona Department of Health Services
Jami Garrison, Arizona Department of Transportation
Susan Smith, designee for Dena Gambrel, AZ Department of Water Resources
Kevin Blake, Northern Arizona Geographic Information Forum
Brian Brady, Yuma Regional Geographic Information System
Gabriel Bey, designee for Howard Ward, Private Sector
Cynthia Naha (Intertribal Council of AZ), designee for Chris English, Bureau of Indian Affairs

Absent were:
Lee Allison, Arizona Geological Survey
Nicole Brown, Arizona Game and Fish Department
Richard Oland, Arizona Department of Revenue
Lee Harbers, Arizona Professional Land Surveyors Association (unsuccessful dial-in)
Jack Johnson, Bureau of Land Management
Keith Larson, Natural Resource Conservation Service
Sharon Nicholson, Arizona Department of Public Safety
Candace Bogart, USDA Forest Service
Rodney Hampton, Arizona Association of Counties
Peter Kozy, Arizona Department of Economic Security
Craig Wissler, University of Arizona

The following matters were discussed, considered, and decided at the meeting:

I.    Call to Order.  The Council was called to order at 10:01am by Tom Sturm, AGIC President.  A count of Board Members established that a quorum was present (see list of Board members and designees in attendance).

Budget Update.  Gary Irish reported on the AGIC budget (see attached AGIC Budget Summary). The status of the AGIC budget indicated that as of December 31, 2006, the AGIC General account showed a balance of $41,198 and the AGIC Conference account showed a balance of $14,342.

II.   Approval of Budget.  Motion made by Lee Allison. Seconded by Tim Smothers.  Approved unanimously.

**Action Item: Budget approved.**

III.  Approval of Minutes of the November 16, 2006 Board meeting.  Motion made by Rick Harrington. Seconded by Jami Garrison.  Approved unanimously.

**Action Item: Minutes of the August 24 Board meeting approved.**

IV.   Committee Reports:

A.    *Administration and Legal Committee*
Tim Smothers gave an update of the AGIC Future Directions activities as part of the Admin and Legal Committee.  The Administration and Legal Committee held two separate meetings (December and January) to have an open discussion regarding AGIC future directions.   Attendees of these meetings had opportunity to voice opinions regarding the AGIC structure, perceived responsibilities, a focus for direction, and recommendations for change.  Tim introduced notes from both meetings and presented some highlights from the reports.  The highlights were as follows: AGIC is an all volunteer organization made up of GIS decision makers throughout our state and therefore we are all champions of GIS. Standards are an important issue AGIC must address. An over arching issue is that the Board needs to understand its importance in the Geospatial make-up of Arizona, its roles and functions (both as a Board and as individual members appointed to the Board), ensuring meeting attendance requirements and a focused commitment to the roles and responsibilities of the board, committees and its membership.  Tim mentioned that board meeting attendance was a problem that was identified at both meetings. If a member cannot attend a board meeting, they should send a designee. Tim also mentioned that better documentation of requests for expenditures to the Board, this especially includes follow up action with respect to identified expenditures. Another issue mentioned was the need for Board members to obtain all relevant documents necessary to prepare for meetings in advance of the meetings.  Tim also mentioned a need to ask if there are any abstentions during all board votes.  There should be action items and motions addressed at Board meetings and informational presentations also need to be made.

Tim discussed that a primary focus of both meetings was to identify (as a board) our work plan and direction for the coming year and into the future.  There are bulleted

items listed in the meeting notes. Tim discussed several in his presentation. The AGIC Conference was identified as the best thing that AGIC does. In addition Tim outlined the attendees' suggestions to develop an Executive Forum to present information to and get support from managers, executives and potential champions. These Executive Forums may take place at meeting of other associations or organizations. Tim mentioned the attendees saw this as a focus in the next AGIC Work Plan. Also, the Portal and IMS need to be prioritized and emphasized in the next year. A champion or champions need to be sought to help AGIC achieve its goals and objectives. The Executive Order (EO) needs to be updated. There are items listed in the EO that were accurate when it was written, but with changes in the environment this may be the time to review the EO and modify it based on current needs. Committees need to be more relevant to AGIC objectives. They may need to change as AGIC objectives change. The current committee structure may not reflect current needs and a new structure is proposed as part of the A&L report.

The A&L Report on Future Directions makes four recommendations. Tim referred to the report and had the Board look at the new proposed committee structure. Aside from the new committee structure, each board member needs to be participate on at least one committee. This will assure board participation in AGIC activities. It is also proposed that all Board and Committee meetings are published in advance for the year. This would allow members to schedule meetings with advance notice. We need to identify and prioritize major activities that AGIC and its committees need to address this next year. Each committee is requested to identify at least one objective and report their findings back to the Board at the next Board Meeting. These committee activities need to happen before the next Board meeting.

Tom Sturm next discussed the actions proposed in the A&L Report. Tom said he has been struggling with how to get the Board to be more proactive. The Board only meets eight hours per year, so most of the activities need to happen at the Committee level. How do we set ourselves up to be proficient during this calendar year? Tom thanked the committee for all their hard work and good ideas. He believes this effort will provide the core of making AGIC more successful. Tom called for comments from the board.

Victor Gass said he read the entire report and thought it was very well done and documented. He said that AGIC has provided DEQ with much advice on how to design its system and application. He has found this input very valuable. He sees himself as a beneficiary of the activities the committee proposed. He would like to be on the infrastructure development activities.

Adam Item thanked Tim and the committee for all its work and believes its time for the board to be brought to the attention of executives more. He called for support of board members to join committees. He stated that much of his daily work ties into what AGIC is all about. He will be working on the Executive Forum but welcomes input and help and may work with other committees.

Tim stated that the report has designated one board member to champion each of the proposed committees.

Victor Gass said that ADEQ has been working on a 'schools' layer. AGIC can help by

identifying priorities, applications and structures to achieve data and other goals.

Jana Hutchins said that in the Committees table, the listed objectives are only presented as examples. The committees will be requested to develop their own objectives for presentation to the board.

Tom Sturm said he is concerned about the amount of work these activities may require of an all volunteer organization. He also has an issue with the term 'critical infrastructure' for one of the committees because of the federal use of that term. He also told the board that finding executive champions is critical and all board members should be trying to gain executive support. Multiple executive champions are better than one champion. He also wanted to improve participation and making sure we have adequate phone telecommunication capabilities for committee and board meetings. We have a problem with this and need to do a better job of this. There is a shift to teleconferencing and AGIC needs to improve this capability.

Adam said that there may be overlap between committees such as the Executive Forum and Outreach Committee objectives. Committees should work together and identify a few things they can do well instead of many things that may not have enough resources to do well or at all.

Tom said he shared that concern and we should look at how much overlap there is between committees.

Jana said she is also concerned grouping to many objectives under one committee. She prefers splitting out very specific objectives by each committee.

Tom wants to make sure we don't have the same five people doing all the activities of different committees. He encouraged committees to coordinate and see if there could be reduction of duplication or combine resources to achieve objectives.

Jana said this could be easier to do once objectives are identified.

Dave Minkel said that AGIC is hamstrung by the lack of resources and executive support. He believes there is a need for a GIO that reports to the Governor's Office and then there would be statewide mandates and resources to achieve common objectives. He prefers to put the highest priority on establishing a GIO position.

Jessica Smothermon said establishing a GIO would be difficult to do this year because she is working on similar issues for a state demographer. You first need to get the attention and support of the Governor's Office and get the process started. It will require multiple years to accomplish. Dave agrees there is a long lead time to achieve this and we need to get started.

Gabe Bey is still unclear of what came out of the committee as a report. He is not sure what the specifics are for Future Directions. He read off some of the recommendations but is not sure what is intended as a mandate for agencies or what is intended for the board and its mission. His concern is that there should be very specific and clear identification of objectives which includes a timeline to achieve. Then form committees

or outreach to other organizations.  There would be a better idea of what is to be achieved, wrap up what we want to accomplish and then look for support from groups with similar objectives.

Tim responded by how the committee addressed many of Gabe's concerns. The notes from the first meeting were distributed to the A&L committee and included all the specific items and comments that were discussed at the first meeting. This included what the EO identified in 1988 and then discussed what it was believed we should be doing now.  Tim believes this may be why we need to review and modify the wording of the EO to reflect current times and issues.  Gene noted that his recent discussions with the Governor's Office, they are willing to work with the board to modify the EO. Gabe believes issues need to be in alignment and the EO should be a primary focus.

Tom stated that he believes the Committees should start identifying what those critical issues are and then look how to address them.  Gabe suggested that outside resources may want to be obtained to achieve the issues being brought up during this discussion.  Jana suggested that the committees start working on these issues and then we may decide what those objectives, priorities and schedules for achieving its goals.  Then there may be recommendations to seek additional resources.  Gabe still suggested obtaining additional resources to help support the board.

Rick Harrington suggested that if the committee structure is implemented, then all things may not be achieved. However, if each committee achieves one thing, then that would be a good step forward.  This was tried several years ago and did not get very far at that time.

Rick made a motion to accept the committee structure and identify objectives and timelines.  Jami Garrison seconded the motion.

Discussion:  Victor Gass suggested putting the Critical infrastructure committee under the Data Resources Committee.  The amendment was accepted.  Tim Smothers said we should first look at what the board wants to achieve and the report recommendations.  Jami would like to see the committee recommendations before the board responds to the recommendations.  There are enough issues that all board members may not be well versed on all the issues.  Rick suggested we move ahead with the committee structure approval.  And do this work so its results are available at least two weeks before the next board meeting.

**Restated motion**:  Accept the committee structure as outlined in the A& L report, accept the committee champions, with a change of Critical Infrastructure Committee to Data Resources Committee, and for the initial items listed in the distributed table to be considered, reviewed and revised as needed, along with timelines and report findings to the next Board meeting.

Motion approved unanimously.

**Action Item: Motion to accept new committee structure and committee findings to be reported at next Board Meeting approved.**

Next item: Require board members to join at least one committee. Moved by Dave Minkel and seconded by Rick Harrington.  Discussion:  Outreach Committee Chair will review board

Motion: Passed..  Two Abstentions:  Jason Howard and Jessica Smothermon.

**Action Item: Motion to require Board Members to join at least one committee approved.**

Motion:  Publish schedule of Board and committee meetings. Post calendar on. Motion made by Dave Minkel and seconded by Rick Harrington.

Motion approved unanimously.

**Action Item: Motion to publish schedule of Board and committee meetings approved.**

Recommendation four was discussed and considered moot and was tabled.

Committee champions or chairs will communicate with AGIC members to create committee membership and schedule committee meeting.

B.  *Data Resources Committee*
Data Resources committee will meet within the next two weeks to address the directions of the board.  Volunteers please contact Gene.

Gene reported that the Imagery Server was up and running and could be accessed by going to the SCO website (sco.az.gov) to logon to the Imagery Server.

Tom reported that Arizona had raised enough money for the State Cartographer to send a letter to NAIP indicating that we wanted statewide 1 meter imagery and would like to be a pilot for 4-band imagery.  Gene has sent that letter.  Gene reported that we had reached the goal of $200,000 as the Arizona portion of the contribution.  More funds would be needed to host and distribute the imagery, but we are doing well and thank you to all those who contributed.  He also said that we would probably not be in a position to set new control for the 2007 imagery, but would start to do so for future ortho imagery projects.

Dave Minkel reported that NGS will be conducting a new readjustment and creating a new datum.  There should be now discrepancy between CORS and OPUS. New standard error and confidence levels of positions.  There is a pilot project to relocated Mexico international boundary markers. The intent is to do the entire US/Mexico border and Arizona is the pilot. A GIS will be built to incorporate border data.  The wall on the border is interfering with GPS on parts of the Border.

Arizona Height Modernization (AZHM) PIJ has been submitted. AFMA has sent out a letter endorsing AZHM.  This may be helpful in obtaining new funds.  There is little chance of getting FY 07 federal funds for this year.

APLS Geospatial Committee has been developing a new standard for positioning. *Dave I couldn't type fast enough for this.* This recommendation may be presented for AGIC approval.

*Standards, standards, standards...... Dave.* Dave referred to the handout which showed relative error between UTM and the accuracy of a proposed new statewide state plane projection. APLS may request modification of statutes to create a new standardized statewide state plane projection. This is being worked on and will be brought back to the board for action in the future. The Data Resources Committee will address this issue.

The APLS Geospatial Committee has been developing a set of standards for the acquisition of geospatial data (e.g. geodetic control, asset inventory, aerial photography, etc.). The intent of these standards is to provide a contemporary basis upon which contracts for the acquisition of geospatial data can be based; it is intended to assist both the client and contractor. These standards will be submitted to APLS for approval and endorsement. It is suggested that AGIC also review and consider endorsement of these standards once they have been finalized by the Geospatial Committee.

As part of the APLS effort to update state statute to contemporary standards and specifications, specifically sections of ARS 33-131 through 33-138, discussion of definition and adoption of a statewide plane coordinate projection occurred. This projection would not replace the current state plane zones; it would be a fourth zone covering the entire state. There is no readily apparent benefit to the surveying community for this undertaking as the current state plane coordinate system seems satisfactory. However, there could be benefit to the GIS community that deals with statewide data holdings. AGIC has been invited, by APLS, to review the proposal of this statewide zone and provide comment back. If AGIC sees worth in the proposal APLS will add the statewide zone definition to the proposed statute change(s). The Data Resources Committee will consider the proposal and report to the AGIC Board with a suggested course of action.

C.      *Technology Committee*
        Gary Irish reported that the committee will be convened soon and please contact Gary if interested in participating. Gary may contact people also. The committee will address the big picture (Enterprise Architecture) and the small picture (Portal, IMS, contributing and sharing data, data agreements).

D.      *Education, Outreach, and Conference Committee*
        1.      Education Working Group. Shea Lemar reported there was a national conference .concerning the use of technology in the classroom coming up in March. Last year, AGIC provided $1500 in scholarship money to help Arizona teachers and geospatial presenters attend the conference. The conference is coming up in March and Shea requested that the board fund $1,000 in scholarship money to help Arizona teachers attend the conference with the understanding that they will go to the GIS presentations and learn how to incorporate GIS into their lessons.
        2.      Motion: AGIC to provide $1000 in scholarships for teachers to learn to use GIS in their classrooms. Jami Garrrison made motion and Rick Harrington seconded.

Motion approved unanimously.

3.   Conference Working Group.  Shea reported that the group has been meeting and is moving right along.  The work groups are making recommendations for expending money. The full committee will approve or deny expenditures.

Motion to authorize the Conference Working Group to spend up to $5,000 for conference related expenses was requested.  Motion made by Jami Garrison and seconded by Manny Roses.

Motion approved unanimously.

**Action Item: Motion for Authority of Conference Work Group to spend up to $5000 was approved.**

We will be looking at improving teleconference capabilities for the board and committee meetings. Jessica reported that the state can provide telecon services. Gene will check with Jessica. Rick asked that webex capabilties be addressed.

E.   Comments, Requests, and Items for Future Agendas.
Gene Trobia requested that the Board discuss funding NAIP 2007 at the next Board meeting.  Tom Sturm requested that a general NAIP follow up discussion take place.

F.   Call to the Public.
No comments.

V.   Next Meeting Time and Date.  The next regularly scheduled Board meeting is May 3, 2007 at 10:00am, location to be determined.

VI.   Adjournment.  The meeting adjourned at 11:56am.

**Attachments:**
AGIC Budget Summary
AGIC November Minutes